

WRONG WAY RECOLLEMENT FOR SCHEMES

PETER JØRGENSEN

The notion of a recollement of triangulated categories was introduced in [1, sec. 1.4]. The prototypical example of a recollement is

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \overset{i^*}{\curvearrowright} & & \overset{j^!}{\curvearrowright} & \\ \mathrm{D}(Z) & \xrightarrow{i_*} & \mathrm{D}(X) & \xrightarrow{j^*} & \mathrm{D}(U). \\ & \underset{i^!}{\curvearrowright} & & \underset{j_*}{\curvearrowright} & \end{array}$$

Here X is a topological space equal to the union of the closed subset Z and the open complement U , and $\mathrm{D}(Z)$, $\mathrm{D}(X)$, and $\mathrm{D}(U)$ are suitable derived categories of sheaves. The triangulated functors in a recollement must satisfy various conditions, most importantly that (i^*, i_*) , $(i_*, i^!)$, $(j^!, j^*)$, and (j^*, j_*) are adjoint pairs.

The purpose of this note is to point out that, somewhat surprisingly, in the case of schemes, there is also a recollement which goes the other way. By way of notation, if X is a scheme then $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{O}_X)$, the derived category of sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules, has the full subcategory $\mathrm{D}(X)$ consisting of complexes with quasi-coherent cohomology. If Z is a closed subscheme, there is also the full subcategory $\mathrm{D}_Z(X)$ consisting of complexes with quasi-coherent cohomology supported on Z .

Theorem. *Let X be a quasi-compact quasi-separated scheme with a closed subscheme Z , suppose that the open subscheme $U = X - Z$ is quasi-compact, and write $U \xrightarrow{u} X$ for the inclusion. Then there is a recollement*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \overset{Lu^*}{\curvearrowright} & & \overset{v}{\curvearrowright} & \\ \mathrm{D}(U) & \xrightarrow{Ru_*} & \mathrm{D}(X) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathrm{D}_Z(X) \\ & \underset{\quad}{\curvearrowright} & & \underset{\quad}{\curvearrowright} & \end{array}$$

where v is the inclusion of the full subcategory $\mathrm{D}_Z(X)$.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14F05, 18E30.

Key words and phrases. Brown Representability Theorem, compactly generated triangulated category, derived category, quasi-coherent sheaf, Thomason Localization Theorem.

Before proving the Theorem, let me give the following Proposition which appears not to be stated in the literature, although it follows easily from known results and is well known to a number of people.

Proposition . *Let T be a compactly generated triangulated category with a set $\mathcal{K}$ which consists of compact objects and is closed under (de)suspension. Then there is a recollement*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \overset{i^*}{\curvearrowright} & & \overset{j_!}{\curvearrowright} & \\ \mathcal{K}^\perp & \xrightarrow{i_*} & \mathsf{T} & \xrightarrow{j^*} & \langle \mathcal{K} \rangle \\ & \underset{i^!}{\curvearrowright} & & \underset{j_*}{\curvearrowright} & \end{array}$$

where i_* and $j_!$ are inclusions of full subcategories.

Here

$$\mathcal{K}^\perp = \{ M \in \mathsf{T} \mid \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathsf{T}}(K, M) = 0 \text{ for each } K \text{ in } \mathcal{K} \},$$

while $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle$ is the smallest triangulated subcategory of T which contains $\mathcal{K}$ and is closed under set indexed coproducts; see [5, def. 3.2.9].

Proof. It follows from the Thomason Localization Theorem, [4, thm. 2.1.1], that $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle$ is a compactly generated triangulated category which is generated by the objects of $\mathcal{K}$. It is clear that the inclusion functor

$$\mathsf{T} \xleftarrow{j_!} \langle \mathcal{K} \rangle$$

is a triangulated functor respecting set indexed coproducts, so by the Brown Representability Theorem, [4, thm. 4.1], there is a right adjoint j^* to $j_!$,

$$\mathsf{T} \xrightarrow{j^*} \langle \mathcal{K} \rangle.$$

By [4, thm. 2.1.3], the compact objects in the compactly generated category $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle$ are precisely the objects of $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle$ which are compact when viewed in T . Hence $j_!$ sends compact objects to compact objects, and so the right-adjoint j^* respects set indexed coproducts by [4, thm. 5.1]. And j^* is triangulated by [5, lem. 5.3.6], so by [4, thm. 4.1] again, there is a right-adjoint j_* to j^* ,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{T} & \xrightarrow{j^*} & \langle \mathcal{K} \rangle \\ & \underset{j_*}{\curvearrowright} & \end{array}$$

As the inclusion $j_!$ is full and faithful, this is the situation considered in [3, prop. 2.7] which gives a recollement

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & i^* & & j_! & \\ & \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowleft & \\ \text{Ker } j^* & \xrightarrow{i_*} & \mathsf{T} & \xleftarrow{j^*} & \langle \mathcal{K} \rangle \\ & \curvearrowleft & & \curvearrowright & \\ & i_! & & j_* & \end{array}$$

where i_* is the inclusion of the full subcategory $\text{Ker } j^*$.

Finally, for N to be in $\text{Ker } j^*$ means $j^*N = 0$ which holds precisely if $\text{Hom}_{\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle}(K, j^*N) = 0$ for each K in $\mathcal{K}$, because the objects of $\mathcal{K}$ generate $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle$. But

$$\text{Hom}_{\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle}(K, j^*N) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathsf{T}}(j_!K, N) = \text{Hom}_{\mathsf{T}}(K, N),$$

so this again holds precisely if $\text{Hom}_{\mathsf{T}}(K, N) = 0$ for each K in $\mathcal{K}$, that is, if N is in $\mathcal{K}^\perp$.

So I can replace $\text{Ker } j^*$ by $\mathcal{K}^\perp$, and this gives the recollement of the Proposition. $\square$

Proof (of Theorem). The category $\mathsf{D}_Z(X)$ is a triangulated subcategory of $\mathsf{D}(X)$ which is closed under set indexed coproducts. Hence $\mathsf{D}_Z(X)$ is a triangulated category with set indexed coproducts. Moreover, by [6, thm. 6.8] there is an object E which is compact in $\mathsf{D}(X)$, sits in $\mathsf{D}_Z(X)$, and whose (de)suspensions generate $\mathsf{D}_Z(X)$. Let $\mathcal{K}$ consist of all (de)suspensions of E . Then $\mathsf{D}_Z(X)$ is a compactly generated triangulated category with compact generators the objects of $\mathcal{K}$.

By [4, thm. 2.1.2], it follows that $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle_{\mathsf{D}_Z(X)}$, the smallest triangulated subcategory of $\mathsf{D}_Z(X)$ which contains $\mathcal{K}$ and is closed under set indexed coproducts, is equal to $\mathsf{D}_Z(X)$ itself. But $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle_{\mathsf{D}_Z(X)}$ is clearly equal to $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle_{\mathsf{D}(X)}$, the smallest triangulated subcategory of $\mathsf{D}(X)$ which contains $\mathcal{K}$ and is closed under set indexed coproducts, so $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle_{\mathsf{D}(X)}$ is equal to $\mathsf{D}_Z(X)$.

I shall simply denote $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle_{\mathsf{D}(X)}$ by $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle$, so

$$\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle = \mathsf{D}_Z(X). \tag{1}$$

By [7, prop. 6.7] there is an adjoint pair of functors

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathsf{L}u^* & \\ & \curvearrowright & \\ \mathsf{D}(\mathcal{O}_U) & \xrightarrow{\quad Ru_* \quad} & \mathsf{D}(\mathcal{O}_X). \end{array}$$

Note that since u is the inclusion of an open subscheme, u^* and hence also $\mathsf{L}u^*$ is just restriction to U . It turns out that $\mathsf{L}u^*$ and Ru_* restrict

to the full subcategories $\mathbf{D}(U)$ and $\mathbf{D}(X)$, and so induce an adjoint pair

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \textstyle\mathbb{L}u^* & \\ & \curvearrowright & \\ \mathbf{D}(U) & \xrightarrow{\quad Ru_* \quad} & \mathbf{D}(X). \end{array}$$

This is obvious for $\mathbb{L}u^*$ which is just restriction to U . For Ru_* it follows from [2, thm. 3.3.3] because u is a quasi-compact quasi-separated morphism.

I will now show

$$\mathcal{K}^\perp = \text{Ess.Im } Ru_* \tag{2}$$

where $\mathcal{K}^\perp$ is taken inside $\mathbf{D}(X)$, while Ru_* is viewed as a functor $\mathbf{D}(U) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}(X)$ and Ess.Im denotes essential image. To see $\supseteq$, let M be in $\text{Ess.Im } Ru_*$; that is, $M \cong Ru_*N$ for some N in $\mathbf{D}(U)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}(X)}(K, M) &\cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}(X)}(K, Ru_*N) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}(U)}(\mathbb{L}u^*K, N) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} 0 \end{aligned}$$

for each K in $\mathcal{K}$, where (a) is because the cohomology of K is supported on Z whence $\mathbb{L}u^*K \cong 0$. Hence M is in $\mathcal{K}^\perp$.

To see $\subseteq$, note first that each M in $\mathbf{D}(X)$ determines a unit morphism

$$M \longrightarrow Ru_*\mathbb{L}u^*M.$$

Let I be a K-injective resolution of M which exists by [7, thm. 4.5]. Since $\mathbb{L}u^*$ is just restriction, $\mathbb{L}u^*I \cong u^*I$. And u^* has an exact left-adjoint $u_!$ so u^*I is also K-injective whence $Ru_*u^*I \cong u_*u^*I$. Hence up to isomorphism, the unit morphism is just the canonical morphism

$$I \longrightarrow u_*u^*I.$$

The restriction of this to U is an isomorphism because u is the inclusion of U into X , so completing the unit morphism to a distinguished triangle

$$M \longrightarrow Ru_*\mathbb{L}u^*M \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow,$$

the cohomology of the cone C is supported on Z , that is, C is in $\mathbf{D}_Z(X)$.

Now let M be in $\mathcal{K}^\perp$; that is,

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}(X)}(K, M) = 0$$

for each K in $\mathcal{K}$. Since also

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}(X)}(K, Ru_*\mathbb{L}u^*M) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}(U)}(\mathbb{L}u^*K, \mathbb{L}u^*M) = 0$$

for each K in $\mathcal{K}$, the distinguished triangle implies

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}(X)}(K, C) = 0$$

for each K in $\mathcal{K}$. But C is in $D_Z(X)$ so this implies $C = 0$. The distinguished triangle thus shows that the unit morphism is an isomorphism,

$$M \cong Ru_* Lu^* M,$$

so $M \cong Ru_* N$ for an N in $D(U)$. Hence M is in $\text{Ess.Im } Ru_*$ as desired.

To conclude the proof, observe that each N in $D(U)$ determines a counit morphism

$$Lu^* Ru_* N \longrightarrow N.$$

Let J be a K -injective resolution of N . Then $Ru_* J \cong u_* J$ and hence $Lu^* Ru_* J \cong u^* u_* J$. Hence up to isomorphism, the counit morphism is just the canonical morphism

$$u^* u_* J \longrightarrow J$$

which is an isomorphism because u is the inclusion of an open subscheme.

By adjoint functor theory this implies that

$$Ru_* \text{ is a full embedding of } D(U) \text{ into } D(X). \quad (3)$$

Let me now use the Proposition with $\mathbf{T} = D(X)$ and $\mathcal{K}$ from above, $D(X)$ being compactly generated by [2, thm. 3.1.1(2)]. The Proposition gives a recollement. Equation (1) says that I can replace $\langle \mathcal{K} \rangle$ with $D_Z(X)$. Equation (2) says that I can replace $\mathcal{K}^\perp$ with $\text{Ess.Im } Ru_*$. And equation (3) says that Ru_* is a full embedding of $D(U)$ into $D(X)$, so I can replace $\text{Ess.Im } Ru_*$ with $D(U)$. This gives the recollement of the Theorem. $\square$

Acknowledgement. I thank professor Leovigildo Alonso Tarrío for stimulating correspondence. The diagrams were typeset with XY-pic.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein, and P. Deligne, *Faisceaux pervers*, Astérisque **100** (1982), 5–171 (Vol. 1 of the proceedings of the conference “Analysis and topology on singular spaces”, Luminy, 1981).
- [2] A. Bondal and M. Van den Bergh, *Generators and representability of functors in commutative and noncommutative geometry*, Mosc. Math. J. **3** (2003), 1–36.
- [3] J.-I. Miyachi, *Localization of triangulated categories and derived categories*, J. Algebra **141** (1991), 463–483.
- [4] A. Neeman, *The Grothendieck duality theorem via Bousfield’s techniques and Brown representability*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1996), 205–236.
- [5] ———, “Triangulated categories”, Ann. of Math. Stud., Vol. 148, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2001.
- [6] R. Rouquier, *Dimensions of triangulated categories*, preprint (2003). `math.CT/0310134 v3`.

- [7] N. Spaltenstein, *Resolutions of unbounded complexes*, Compositio Math. **65** (1988), 121–154.

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS, LEEDS LS2
9JT, UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail address: `popjoerg@maths.leeds.ac.uk`

URL: `http://www.maths.leeds.ac.uk/~popjoerg`